

*In Resp. of Comments*

Printed: 04-20-97  
By: Howe, Carol  
Priority: Normal  
Topic: MORE ON THE CALFED DEBATE (  
Sent: 04-18-97  
From: rwoodard@goldeneye.water.ca.go  
To: Howe, Carol; Carol Howe

*Overall  
CALFED  
outside scope  
of WG  
Program*

Mail\*Link»

MORE ON THE CALFED DEBATE (fwd)

>Date: Thu, 17 Apr 1997 12:37:23 -0700 (PDT)  
>From: Chris Foe <chrisf@bptcpl.swrcb.ca.gov>  
>Subject: MORE ON THE CALFED DEBATE (fwd)  
>To: cdarling@water.ca.gov, rwoodard@water.ca.gov

>Cindy, Rick FYI Chris

>----- Forwarded message -----

>Date: Thu, 17 Apr 1997 11:37:46 -0700 (PDT)  
>From: Vic DeVlaming <vicdv@bptcpl.swrcb.ca.gov>  
>To: pwt - contaminants <aquasci@aol.com>, awconsult@aol.com,  
> bfinlays@hq.dfg.ca.gov, bherbold@aol.com, bobf@delta.dfg.ca.gov,  
> brucet@sfei.org, chrisf@bptcpl.swrcb.ca.gov, dehinton@ucdavis.edu,  
> dmfray@ucdavis.edu, gfredlee@aol.com, hbailey@evs.wa.com, jay@sfei.org,  
> jtm@crl.com, karent@bptcpl.swrcb.ca.gov, kkuivila@usgs.gov,  
> lsmith@usgs.gov, lrbrown@usgs.gov, lwintern@water.ca.gov,  
> mjsnyder@ucdavis.edu, mjunginc@aol.com, nsinghasemanon@cdpr.ca.gov,  
> phyllisfox@aol.com, scottogle@eco-risk.com, slanderson@lbl.gov,  
> snluoma@usgs.gov, spies@amarine.com, valc@bptcpl.swrcb.ca.gov,  
> wabennett@ucdavis.edu  
>Subject: MORE ON THE CALFED DEBATE

>Chris-

>Having read the barrage of e-mail on the Darling/CalfED issue, I believe  
>the contaminant PWT has to send Cindy a strong message.

>The message is that the proposals the PWT approved should be funded  
>by CalfED. The proposals are sound proposals which address the critical  
>issue of whether contaminants have negative impacts on aquatic  
>populations of the Sacramento/San Joaquin system. The intent of our PWT  
>was not, as I remember, to develop a comprehensive, long-term program to  
>address this issue, but rather to offer  
>up sound proposals which provide some insight into the  
>contaminant-aquatic populations relationship. Our proposals do that.

>The PWT was not assembled to "correct" the CalfED process!!!!!! While I  
>agree that the PWT can and should give a message to CalfED on their  
>process, let us not forget our hard work and the proposals. I feel very  
>strongly that to dismiss the hard work of the PWT and to "trash" the  
>proposals would be a serious error. Furthermore, such failure to support  
>our proposals would not reflect  
>well on our efforts of the last several months. Come on PWTers, let's  
>stand behind the proposals which came out of our group. CalfED should be  
>encouraged to fund them. I have no problem with the idea that CalfED  
>should develop a comprehensive program to identify problems and develop

>restoration projects, but that should not interfere with funding of the  
>projects endorsed by the PWT---lets not get totally distracted here. The  
>data collected in the projects endorsed by the PWT can only be useful in  
>providing a greater understanding of the potential effects of  
>contaminants on aquatic populations.

>Victor

>  
>